



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

enthusiastic with the same writer (*ibid.*, pp. 8 ff.) over its real Athenian character, or to shake his head with Professor Wilamowitz and murmur "Diese ephebenordnung ist ein wunderbares ding" (*op. cit.*, p. 191). He will also probably regret that in proving the late origin of the institution it becomes necessary to explain away every sort of early reference that might possibly point to the existence of such an institution. In chapter ii of Part I the author is not unsuccessful in taking issue with those who see in Thucydides' use of οἱ νεώτατοι (ii. 13. 7; 21. 2) a reference to the ephebi. However, the chapter dealing with the difficulty arising from the use of the term περίπολος is not so successful and is perhaps the least convincing of the whole treatise. Others (Girard, *Dict. des Antiq.*, s.v. "ephebi"; Gilbert, *Greek Constitutional Antiquities*, Eng., p. 313) have admitted that the term is sometimes applied to hired mercenaries on guard duty (Thuc. iv. 67. 1; viii. 92. 2), as well as to the ephebi in their second year of service. One experiences more difficulty however in following our author in assuming that when Aeschines speaks with pride of his service as περίπολος τῆς χώρας ταύτης (Fals. Leg. 167) he is referring to the years when he eked out his scanty income by service as a mercenary, and that his συνέφηβοι are merely some young fellows of his own age. Even the absence of any evidence to prove that Demosthenes had ever been an ἔφηβος does not help the matter. Two years of service as a hired mercenary are hardly glorious enough to make even an Aeschines proud of his military career.

The most serious objection that the reviewer finds to Mlle Brenot's discussion is that if one must fix the date of the institution's birth at a year or two before our full information about it begins, one is also compelled to assume that it sprang full-grown and mature, in the form described by Aristotle, from the brow of some Athenian Zeus. There is absolutely no room for infancy or growth. Even the suggestion that Plato is responsible for the institution (p. 41; Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 194) does not convince us that there may not have been something much earlier from which the late fourth-century institution developed. No one pretends to doubt that changes came in it in the course of the third century. It is at least possible that the form as described by Aristotle was the result of change.

J. O. LOFBERG

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Collectanea Hispanica. Par CHARLES UPSON CLARK. Paris: Honoré Champion. Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XXIV, September, 1920, 1-243.

American scholarship may well take pride in its recent achievements in the field of paleography. Burnham's fine collection of facsimiles of Spanish MSS, Loew's great work on the Beneventan script, and Rand and Howe's study of the script of the Tours scriptorium are models each of its kind. To

this list we may now add Professor Clark's important study of the Spanish script, which he modestly calls "Collectanea." The book is based on material collected during a six weeks' visit to Spain in 1907, an amazing achievement when one considers the difficulties often encountered in working in Spanish libraries. Its appearance has been delayed, first by the failure of the Italian firm which undertook to publish it, and later, when it was nearly half-done, by the outbreak of the war.

The first chapter (pp. 5-23) gives an excellent historical sketch of previous works dealing with the Spanish paleography. Chapter ii (pp. 24-74) contains a list of MSS or fragments of MSS still in existence that are written, entirely or in part, in the Spanish script; a few MSS are included that contain only marginalia written in this script. The paleographical peculiarities of each MS are indicated (*i*-longa, *ti*-ligature, etc.) and references are given to discussions by other scholars or to facsimiles. The list is instructive; of the two hundred and twelve MSS two-thirds are still in Spain, thirty-nine are in France, eighteen in England, and twelve in Italy. They contain, with comparatively few exceptions, church texts, bibles, commentaries, works of the fathers, liturgy, and the like. There are a number of glossaries, a few grammars and law books, and some with miscellaneous contents. Professor Clark discovered an eleventh-century Terence that had hitherto escaped notice. The most important MS for the classical student is the Leyden Ausonius (Voss. F. 111), not Corippus as a slip of the author has it. This codex, as Tafel has shown (Rheinisches Museum 69. 630), once formed one MS with Paris 8093 and was probably written at Lyons, where there seems to have been a settlement of Spaniards in the ninth century. We may assume with the author that his list is almost complete; the only omissions that I have observed are: Glasgow, Hunterian Museum T. 4. 13, tenth-century "westgotische Schrift mit manchen Eigentümlichkeiten" according to Schenkl, *Bibliotheca patrum latinorum britannica*, II, 3, Nr. 3122; according to the same author (I, 2, Nr. 1182) the first scribe of Cheltenham 1326 shows Spanish influence; Tafel reports (*loc. cit.*, p. 631) that Lyons 443, written in uncials and half-uncials, has several gaps filled in by Spanish scribes. Lists are also given of dated MSS, of scribes or miniaturists, of scriptoria and of facsimiles; in addition to the facsimile of Voss. 111 found in Schenkl's edition, mention should be made of those in Peiper's Teubner edition and in Gaselee's reproduction of the Trau MS of Petronius.

Chapter iii deals with the characteristics of the Spanish script. The forms of the letters are discussed in detail, though one misses a comment on the use of the uncial form of a, within the line as well as at the end (Plates 67, 69). The methods of abbreviation are described and an alphabetical list of abbreviations is given. Other sections deal with orthography, syllable division, diacritical marks and punctuation, and the evolution of the script. Clark accepts Loew's division into four periods but thinks the question cannot be settled until we have facsimiles of all the known Spanish MSS.

In point of fact, none of the topics dealt with in this chapter can be definitely disposed of until the MSS themselves are carefully examined; facsimiles are insufficient. Furthermore, if one is to write a history of the evolution of the script and of the development of local schools, the cursive scripts must be included in the investigation. Professor Clark has cleared the way for such a work and has greatly lightened the task for his successor.

The last chapter is devoted to the transcription of the plates, with a detailed description of the MSS and comments on the script. The plates, seventy in number, are from photographs made, with but few exceptions, by Professor Clark himself; apparently a hand camera, 5 by 7 inches, was used. Most of them can be read without the use of a glass. While reduced facsimiles of this sort are not practicable for paleographical exercises they are quite satisfactory for the study of the script, and further publication of such facsimiles should be encouraged. The great cost of the larger publications has been a handicap to paleographical study. There is room also for inexpensive photographs of entire MSS in reduced format alongside the sumptuous reproductions of the Leyden series.

CHARLES H. BEESON

Titi Livi ab urbe condita recognoverunt Carolus Flamstead Walters et Robertus Seymour Conway. Tomus II, libri VI–X. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, MDCCCXIX.

With the appearance of this volume we have at last a trustworthy text and apparatus of the first decade of Livy, and a great reproach to classical scholarship has thus been removed. It is not that the Teubner text was not a good one—there are no startling changes in the Oxford edition—but we now know where we stand and can feel sure that we have all the evidence before us.

We are reminded in the Preface that seven MSS hitherto unknown or unused have been added to the apparatus, that the important MSS already known have been recollated and that the *deteriores* have been re-examined. The collations of Alschevski and Frigelli, though better than most collations of their day, were faulty, often contradicting each other, and could not be trusted. The editors have not accepted even Dianu's careful collation of the Thuaneus, but have made a new collation and verified all the discrepancies between Dianu's and their own, so that we may feel sure we have an accurate report on the readings of this important MS. This codex, by the way, is a ninth-, not a tenth-century MS, as I hope to show elsewhere, and the corrector did his work about the middle of the ninth century; he is certainly the scribe who wrote the first pages of the codex.

The reason why we have had to wait so long for a satisfactory edition of the first decade is obvious; few classical texts require more drudgery and